

**From:** Jim Tollefson  
**To:** Microsoft ATR  
**Date:** 1/24/02 1:07am  
**Subject:** Microsoft Settlement

To: Renata B. Hesse  
Antitrust Division  
U.S. Department of Justice  
601 D Street NW  
Suite 1200  
Washington, DC 20530-0001

Under the Tunney Act, I wish to comment on the proposed Microsoft settlement. In specific,

Section III.A.2. allows Microsoft to retaliate against any OEM that ships Personal Computers containing a competing Operating System but no Microsoft operating system.

Why should Microsoft care what operating system ships on a PC, as long as they get their license fees on the copies that do ship. They are just trying to maintain their cash flow at the expense of consumers. Why should I have to pay for a copy of software (Windows) that I will never use.

If OEMs were free of the threat of retaliation from Microsoft, I could purchase only the hardware and software that I need/want on my PC. Thus saving me money and frustration over the long term.

By allowing this practice, the Proposed Final Judgement (PFJ) is encouraging Microsoft to extend its monopoly in Intel-compatible operating systems, and to leverage it into new areas.

I feel this should be prohibited by the PFJ.

Thanks for your time,

Jim Tollefson  
Senior Systems Engineer  
Seattle, WA

--

Jim Tollefson jimt@oz.net

"UNIX was never designed to keep people from doing stupid things, because that policy would also keep them from doing clever things." (Doug Gwyn)